



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,898	03/17/2004	Guillaume Delarue	5974-156	4620
27383 7590 03/29/2007 CLIFFORD CHANCE US LLP 31 WEST 52ND STREET NEW YORK, NY 10019-6131			EXAMINER LE, DEBBIE M	
			ART UNIT 2168	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE 3 MONTHS			MAIL DATE 03/29/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/802,898

Applicant(s)

DELARUE, GUILLLAUME

Examiner

DEBBIE M. LE

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

0

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 July 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/17/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim s1-10, 12 recite phrase "adapted to" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). To further assist the Applicant to understand the basis of the rejection, the Applicant is directed to MPEP § 2106 II(c).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ho et al (US Patent 6,964,053 B2).

As per claim 1, Ho discloses [a] computer system for allowing at least two client processes (Fig. 1, col. 10, lines 35-40) to access data through a server process (col. 10, lines 31-33, as common application metamodel (CAM), said server processing comprising an application and a engine (Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 44-46, as CAM consists of language metamodels (Applicant's an application) and application domain interface metamodel (Applicant's an engine),

wherein the engine is adapted to receive requests (col. 11, lines 35-40, as these application interface are access points to the applications through which all input and output are connected, these interface are in terms of application interface metamodels) in a first language from one of client processes and issue responses in the first language to said one of client processes (col. 4, lines 5-9, as initiating the transaction on the end user application in a first language to the server), and

the engine is adapted to communicate with the application in a second language distinct from the first language (col. 4, lines 10-14, as converting the transaction to an application written in a different language running on the application server), the second language being an object-oriented language with objects having properties and

associated with events (Fig. 4, as Cobol metamodel, C metamodel, col. 4, lines 20-21, col. 10, line 53, col. 14, lines 45-53); and

the application is adapted to instantiate objects, to evaluate properties of instantiated objects based on data and to react to events (col. 11, lines 42-67, col. 12, lines 17-27, as type descriptor metamodel mapping data types to support data transforming from one language into another); and

wherein the engine is adapted to issue responses in the first language to said one of client processes according to the objects instantiated by the application and to their properties (col. 13, lines 21-42, as populate the data into the original format as previous output form generated by the user, transmitting the transaction output data to the user); and

the engine is adapted to provide updated properties and events to the application in the second language according to requests received in the first language from said one of client processes (col. 15, lines 44-58, as additional language models are added to CAM).

As per claim 2, Ho further teaches the engine is further adapted to receive requests in the first language from another client process and issue responses in the first language to said another client process; the engine is adapted to issue responses in the first language to said another client process according to the objects instantiated by the application and to their properties; and the engine is adapted to provide updated properties and events to the application in the second language according to requests received in the first language from said another client process (Fig. 1, different client

computer platform and applications such as JAVA, C, C++, HTML, XML, Dynamic HTML, WML is transmitted to the server, and these limitations have been rejected by the same reasons has provided above in the detailed rejected of claim 1).

As per claim 3, Ho further teaches wherein a client process communicates with the engine of the server process through an application process, said application process comprising: a second engine adapted to communicate with the client process; a second application adapted to communicate with the second engine; and a client interface adapted to communicate with the engine in the first language and adapted to communicate with the second application and/or with the second engine (Fig. 4, application interface metamodels, such as Cobol metamodel, C metamodel).

As per claim 4, Ho further teaches wherein the engine is further adapted to receive requests in a third language from another client process and issue responses in the third language to said another client process, the third language being different from the first language and distinct from the second language; the engine is adapted to issue responses in the third language to said another client process according to the objects instantiated by the application and to their properties; and the engine is adapted to provide updated properties and events to the application in the second language according to requests received in the third language from said another client process (Fig. 1, different client computer platform and applications such as JAVA, C, C++, HTML, XML, Dynamic HTML, WML is transmitted to the server, and these limitations have been rejected by the same reasons has provided above in the detailed rejected of claim 1).

As per claim 5, Ho further teaches wherein the engine is provided with a first renderer for communicating with said client process in said first language and with a second renderer for communicating with said another client process in said third language (Fig. 8, col. 8, lines 20-27, col. 10, lines 5-8, col. 12, lines 33-39).

As per claim 6, Ho further teaches wherein a client process communicates with the engine of the server process through an application process, said application process comprising: a second engine adapted to communicate with the client process; a second application adapted to communicate with the second engine; and a client interface adapted to communicate with the engine in the first language and adapted to communicate with the second application and/or with the second engine (Fig. 4, application interface metamodels, such as Cobol metamodel, C metamodel).

As per claim 7, Ho further teaches wherein the engine is further adapted to receive requests in a third language from another client process and issue responses in the third language to said another client process, the third language being different from the first language and distinct from the second language; the engine is adapted to issue responses in the third language to said another client process according to the objects instantiated by the application and to their properties; the engine is adapted to provide updated properties and events to the application in the second language according to requests received in the third language from said another client process (Fig. 8, col. 8, lines 20-27, col. 10, lines 5-8, col. 12, lines 33-39, Fig. 1, different client computer platform and applications such as JAVA, C, C++, HTML, XML, Dynamic HTML, WML).

As per claim 8, Ho further teaches wherein the engine is provided with a first renderer for communicating with said client process in said first language and with a second renderer for communicating with said another client process in said third language (Fig. 8, col. 8, lines 20-27, col. 10, lines 5-8, col. 12, lines 33-39, Fig. 1, different client computer platforms and applications).

As per claim 9, Ho further teaches wherein a client process communicates with the engine of the server process through an application process, said application process comprising: a second engine adapted to communicate with the client process; a second application adapted to communicate with the second engine; and a client interface adapted to communicate with the engine in the first language and also adapted to communicate with the second application and or with the second engine (Fig. 3, col. 10, lines 44-46, as CAM consists of language metamodels).

As per claim 10, Ho further teaches wherein a client process communicates with the engine of the server process through an application process, said application process comprising: a second engine adapted to communicate with the client process; a second application adapted to communicate with the second engine; and a client interface adapted to communicate with the engine in the first language and adapted to communicate with the second application and/or with the second engine (Fig. 4, different Application Interface Metamodels, C metamodel, Cobol metamodel).

As per claim 11, Ho further teaches wherein the first language includes html (col. 4, lines 15-19, as JAVA, C, C++, HTML, XML, Dynamic HTML, WML).

Art Unit: 2168

Claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale as stated in claim 1 argument.

Moreover, Ho teaches a second renderer adapted to receive requests from a client process in a third language and to issue responses in the third language, the third language being different from the first language (Fig. 8, col. 8, lines 20-27, col. 10, lines 5-8, col. 12, lines 33-39, Fig. 1, different client computer platform and applications such as JAVA, C, C++, HTML, XML, Dynamic HTML, WML); an application interface adapted to issue and receive messages in a second language, distinct from the first language and from the third language (Fig. 4, # 423, as IMS transaction message metamodel).

As per claim 13, Ho teaches wherein the first language includes html (col. 4, lines 15-19, as JAVA, C, C++, HTML, XML, Dynamic HTML, WML).

Conclusion


The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBBIE M. LE whose telephone number is (571) 272-4111. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2168

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Primary Examiner
3/12/07